**Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A 280.38
M34C
5
THE Copy

Market Administrator's

# BULLETIN

MARKET ADMINISTRATOR

U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
APR 15 1970
CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

Published at 79 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215
ISSUED FOR PRODUCERS WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

MARCH, 1970 Vo. 26 No. 3

A glass of milk is so good it's like having a party every time you drink one. It's so cool and refreshing, so good for you . . . just like all milk products.

## IMPROVING QUALITY STANDARDS FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

By Herbert L. Forest, Director, Dairy Division, C&MS, USDA

Better quality butter, cheese, nonfat dry milk, and other dairy products, with better keeping ability, may be on the way.

A step in that direction is a revised set of recommended standards for manufacturing milk—the raw material for such dairy products—being proposed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The better the raw material is the better the final product, assuming good manufacturing processes. Hence there is the proposal to help States, which have the primary responsibility, raise the quality of manufacturing milk throughout the Nation.

The revised standards, proposed for State adoption and enforcement, are the result of a cooperative effort between USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service and two agencies of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

These standards are modeled closely after those developed in a continuing USDA-State-industry project stretching over many years. The new proposal, however, is intended to unify the earlier standards issued in 1963, with proposals of other government agencies and thus help eliminate overlapping, duplicate, and conflicting requirements.

Major additions to, or changes in, the earlier standards included in the new proposal are:

*Lowering the bacterial limit for "acceptable quality" manufacturing milk. The bacteria limit in the proposed standards would be retained for three years after adoption by a State. Then the limit would be lowered to one-third of that level. It is expected that processing plant fieldmen and State extension workers will help farmers improve sanitation to the extent necessary to meet this requirement.

*Requiring more stringent regulations for farm water supplies, which must be enforced by the State.

*Requiring the abnormal milk test program prescribed by the National Mastitis Council.

Retained in the newly proposed standards are provisions of the 1963 standards which provided for:

*Farm inspection and certification, including careful checks on the health of the dairy herd, milking facilities and procedures, sanitation of utensils and equipment, and water supply.

*Inspection of incoming raw milk at processing plants for odor, physical appearance, bacteria, and sediment.

*Plant licensing, requiring adequate procedures and facilities for sanitation before issuance of a license by the regulating State agency.

USDA officials emphasize that the proposed standards are for voluntary adoption by States which have no such regulations in effect or which have less stringent regulations. Some States, they point out, already have equal or better regulatory laws in effect. And many dairy farmers and milk processing plants already meet or exceed the requirements of the recommended standards.

Nevertheless, there are some areas of the country which lag in milk quality. Since 30 percent of all milk produced in the Nation is produced specifically for manufacturing use, deficiencies by some producers in some areas can have a far-reaching effect on the general level of the Nation's dairy products.

The proposed standards, if adopted and enforced by the States, will require dairy farmers who do not meet the requirements of the recommended standards to improve the quality of the milk they offer for sale to processing plants. Most farmers will not find it too difficult or costly to do so. Dairy specialists state that the greatest need for improvement is in the area of general housekeeping and production techniques.

(Continued on Back Page)

**MIAMI VALLEY** Milk Marketing Area
434 Third National Building, North Main Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402

Federal Order No. 34
Telephone: 513 / 222-5846

# Miami Valley

## MARKET FACTS FOR EASY REFERENCE

| | Feb. 1970 | Jan. 1970 | Feb. 1969 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **PRICE SUMMARY** | | | |
| Producers' Uniform Price (3.5%) | $5.71 | $5.81 | $5.69 |
| Class I (3.5%) | 6.29 | 6.28 | 6.10 |
| Class II (3.5%) | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.19 |
| Producer Butterfat Differential for each 1/10% | 8.0¢ | 8.0¢ | 7.9¢ |
| **RECEIPTS AND UTILIZATION SUMMARY** | | | |
| Class I Pounds | 27,877,991 | 32,753,640 | 28,845,232 |
| Class II Pounds | 11,377,094 | 9,742,878 | 7,656,239 |
| Percent of Producer Milk in Class I | 71.0 | 77.1 | 79.0 |
| Percent of Producer Milk in Class II | 29.0 | 22.9 | 21.0 |
| **PRODUCER MILK RECEIPTS** | | | |
| Total Pounds of Producer MIlk Delivered | 39,255,085 | 42,496,518 | 36,501,471 |
| Total Number of Producers | 1,365 | 1,360 | 1,372 |
| Average Daily Receipts per All Producers | 1,027 | 1,008 | 950 |
| Average Butterfat Test | 3.91 | 3.99 | 3.87 |
| Total Value of Producer Milk at Test | $2,369,134 | $2,634,188 | $2,183,755 |
| Income per Producer (7 Day Average) | $434 | $437 | $398 |
| Supply-Demand Adjustment to Class I Price (Cents) | +.18 | +.21 | +.33 |
| **NUMBER OF PRODUCER CHANGES** | | | |
| New Producers | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| Producers Resumed Shipping | 2 | -0- | 1 |
| Producers Off Market | 9 | 17 | 4 |
| **AVERAGE DAILY SALES (Quarts)** | | | |
| Milk | 308,735 | 324,353 | 330,081 |
| Buttermilk | 9,877 | 12,069 | 8,253 |
| Chocolate | 30,699 | 29,196 | 30,055 |
| Skim | 112,740 | 118,958 | 107,024 |
| Cream | 5,044 | 5,017 | 5,108 |

**MIAMI VALLEY** Milk Marketing Area
434 Third National Building, North Main Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402

Federal Order No. 34
Telephone: 513 / 222-5846

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS **MIAMI VALLEY MARKETING AREA** FEB., 1961 – '70

| Year | Receipts from Producers | Average Butterfat Test | Percentage of Producer Milk in Each Class | | Uniform Producer Price (3.5%) | Class Prices at 3.5% | | Number of Producers | Average Daily Production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Class I | Class II | | Class I | Class II | | |
| 1961 . . . | 35,443,426 | 3.92 | 73.2 | 26.8 | 4.30 | 4.735 | 3.262 | 1,911 | 662 |
| 1962 . . . | 35,721,435 | 3.92 | 72.7 | 27.3 | 4.25 | 4.62 | 3.416 | 1,686 | 757 |
| 1963 . . . | 32,999,605 | 3.94 | 75.2 | 24.8 | 4.11 | 4.44 | 3.237 | 1,519 | 776 |
| 1964 . . . | 38,098,508 | 3.90 | 74.3 | 25.7 | 4.14 | 4.48 | 3.275 | 1,457 | 902 |
| 1965 . . . | 35,852,031 | 3.92 | 83.4 | 16.6 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 3.282 | 1,413 | 906 |
| 1966 . . . | 35,224,583 | 3.90 | 78.0 | 22.0 | 4.55 | 4.86 | 3.534 | 1,372 | 917 |
| 1967 . . . | 36,620,920 | 3.89 | 78.7 | 21.3 | 5.28 | 5.62 | 4.038 | 1,356 | 965 |
| 1968 . . . | 37,174,875 | 3.92 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 5.38 | 5.76 | 3.91 | 1,377 | 931 |
| 1969 . . . | 36,501,471 | 3.87 | 79.0 | 21.0 | 5.69 | 6.10 | 4.19 | 1,372 | 950 |
| 1970 . . . | 39,255,085 | 3.91 | 71.0 | 29.0 | 5.71 | 6.29 | 4.26 | 1,365 | 1,027 |

## USDA CAUTIONS CATTLEMEN ABOUT ANAPLASMOSIS VACCINE FOR BROOD COWS

Vaccinating brood cows with anaplasmosis vaccine sometimes may cause fatal side-effects in calves, the U. S. Department of Agriculture cautioned.

Two components of USDA's Agricultural Research Service, the Veterinary Biologics Division and the Animal Health Division, have just completed a field investigation of 23 herds in Texas, Louisiana, and Georgia, in which early calf losses were recently reported. The Federal investigators found evidence in about half of these herds that isohemolytic anemia (nonfunctioning of red blood cells caused by immune reaction) was involved, with anaplasmosis vaccine as a possible contributing factor. In these herds, calf loss averaged about 10 percent, investigators say. The ARS men confirmed earlier reports that most of the affected calves were Charolais or Charolais crosses, although they noted a few cases in other breeds.

Only one manufacturer, Fort Dodge Laboratories of Fort Dodge, Iowa, is licensed by the Veterinary Biologics Division to produce anaplasmosis vaccine for interstate commerce. The licensee has agreed to relabel all existing bottles of the vaccine, marketed under the trade name Anaplaz. From now on, labels will caution owners of brood cows about possible side-effects, which will be spelled out with pertinent details in product literature accompanying each bottle, as is customary.

Cattlemen say that the problem occurs in young calves that generally seem normal at birth. Several hours later, however, they become extremely ill, and most of them die, apparently from anemia. Indications are that the problem is triggered when the calf first drinks colostrum and that trouble can be averted if calves are kept from drinking colostrum from their dam for at least 24 hours after birth.

ARS officials have concluded that vaccinating brood cows for anaplasmosis involves a calculated risk. On one hand, the vaccine prevents a disease said to be the fourth most costly one of U. S. cattle. On the other hand, facts support the conclusion that anaplasmosis vaccine somehow may be a contributing factor to isohemolytic anemia of calves, although reported incidence is very small in terms of overall calf numbers and the number of vaccine doses used. Cattlemen need to consult their veterinarians to weigh these two risks.

How early calf losses could possibly be related to vaccination of the cow herd is unclear, ARS scientists say. However, the evidence fits a theory that blood incompatibility between calf and dam is the connecting link.

The theory assumes an X-factor in the blood of some, but not all cattle. If a bull carries the X-factor, but the cow doesn't, half the calves are likely to inherit the X-factor from the bull, setting up a situation where the calf's blood differs from that of the dam.

Theoretically, if the cow is injected with blood carrying the X-factor, her body will recognize the factor as a "foreign substance" and manufacture antibodies against it. These antibodies could be transferred to the calf in the cows's colostrum and could destroy the red blood cells in a calf carrying the X-factor.

Cows ordinarily don't get blood transfusions, but anaplasmosis vaccine is manufactured from blood which theoretically could stimulate formation of anti-X antibodies in some cases. But ARS scientists emphasize that there is no direct evidence that this theory is correct. Isohemolytic anemia has not been experimentally documented in cattle, although it has been shown to exist in horses, swine, and dogs.

## IMPROVING QUALITY STANDARDS FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

(Continued from Front Page)

The proposed standards, when adopted, would also correct deficiencies in processing plants. These are often related to such practices as refilling large storage tanks before they are completely emptied and cleaned and insufficient cooling of milk in storage. Another problem, in some areas, is a long run between farm and processing plant which may permit bacteria build-up during transit.

USDA dairy specialists have been meeting with State regulatory officials to examine problems of dairy farmers and processing plants and consider the steps that would be necessary to bring milk quality and farm and processing plant practices up to the level of the proposed recommended standards. In several regional meetings, they also discussed how the quality standards and farm requirements could be applied in cases where milk is shipped across State lines.

State officials, as well as producers, processors, and anyone interested, now have opportunity to comment on the proposed standards. The extent to which they are adopted and enforced by the States will determine the effect they will have in assuring a continuously wholesome and high-quality supply of dairy products for American consumers. It could be a long step forward.

## Market Quotations

FEBRUARY 1970

| | |
|---|---|
| MINNESOTA - WISCONSIN PRICE SERIES | $4.63 |
| Butter-Powder Price | 4.26 |
| Average Price per lb. 92-score butter at Chicago | .6760 |
| Average carlot prices, spray process nonfat dry milk, f.o.b. Chicago area manufacturing plants | .2315 |

## USDA LIFTS SOME PROVISIONS IN TWO OHIO MILK ORDERS

The U. S. Department of Agriculture has temporarily suspended some provisions of the Northwestern Ohio and Miami Valley, Ohio, Federal milk marketing orders, to include milk for yogurt in Class II milk, the lower-value milk use class. The orders previously designated it Class I.

USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service officials said the action was requested by milk handlers regulated by the two orders, who distribute yogurt in competition with handlers operating under nearby Federal milk orders. The adjacent orders classify milk for yogurt as a Class II use.

Handlers under the Northwestern Ohio and Miami Valley orders asked for the action to place them on a more comparable cost basis with handlers under the nearby orders.

The suspension action will apply to milk classified and priced under the order starting with February, and will continue until action can be completed on proposals to amend five Ohio milk orders, considered at a public hearing last year in Columbus. The classification of yogurt was an issue at the hearing. C&MS officials are now studying the evidence received, and a decision based on the hearing record will be issued as soon as possible.

## CCC DISCONTINUES SALES OF NONFAT DRY MILK FOR UNRESTRICTED USE

The U. S. Department of Agriculture has announced that sales of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of nonfat dry milk for unrestricted use are being discontinued immediately. This action amends the CCC Monthly Sales List for March 1970.

The halt in CCC sales of nonfat dry milk will continue through March 31.

As indicated March 12, prices of dairy products, including nonfat dry milk, under the 1970-71 price-support program will be governed by parity data available on March 30, 1970.